

Jesse S. Brar, Utah Bar # 9469
Email: jbrar@xmission.com
670 East 3900 South, Suite 101
Salt Lake City, Utah 84107
Telephone: (801) 269-9541
Facsimile: (801) 269-9581

Sharon Preston, Utah Bar # 7690
Email: sharon.preston@yahoo.com
670 East 3900 South, Suite 101
Salt Lake City, Utah 84107
Telephone: (801) 269-9541
Facsimile: (801) 269-9581

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

Paula Self, Linda Duncan, Sheri Kiddy, Leslie
Demull, Timothy Van Hoose, Michael
Combs, Isabel Shelton, Ramy Ibrahim, Scott
Wright, Wilda Sellers, Damon Hylton,
Deyaska Spencer, Larry Clark, Lativia
Williams, and Kevin Stagner Individually and
on Behalf of Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

TPUSA, Inc. and Teleperformance Group,
Inc., Corporations,

Defendants.

**REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED RULING
OR HEARING ON PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO APPROVE PLAINTIFFS'
PROPOSED LETTER AND PROPOSED
AMENDED WEBSITE**

Case No.: 2:08-CV-395 PMW

Judge: Hon. Paul M. Warner

Plaintiff's Paula Self, Linda Duncan, Sheri Kiddy, Leslie Demull, Timothy Van Hoose,
Michael Combs, Isabel Shelton, Ramy Ibrahim, Scott Wright, Wilda Sellers, Damon Hylton,

Deyaska Spencer, Larry Clark, Lativia Williams, and Kevin Stagner, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), by and through their attorneys, hereby requests a expedited ruling or that a hearing be set on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Approve Plaintiffs’ Proposed Letter and Proposed Amended Website. This request is being made on the following grounds:

1. Plaintiffs have made all the Court-ordered changes to the website.
2. Plaintiffs have also made all of the additional changes the Defendants demanded in their Response and in their Surreply Brief.
3. Plaintiffs made the additional changes requested by Defendants in order to expedite the resolution of this matter, in spite of the fact that Defendant’s additional proposed changes were requested “after the fact” of the Court’s ruling. The court didn’t order these things (for example, the jury/judge distinction) and the Court’s approval of the website/letter should presumably reflect the court’s ruling, and not whatever additional preferences the Defendants have decided to “add” after the Court’s ruling on the Plaintiff’s Motion.
4. The issue of “number of consent forms” is relevant to the issue of class certification, *see e.g. Davis v. Charoen Pokphand (USA), Inc.*, 303 F.Supp.2d 1272, 1277 (M.D. Ala. 2004) (number of consent forms is relevant to show where there is an interest by potential class members), and it is urgent that the new consent forms be obtained as soon as possible so that counsel for Plaintiffs can prepare the motion for class certification.

5. Plaintiffs object to Defendant's request for copies of every letter Plaintiffs' counsel sends out pursuant to the Court's Order. First of all, this is another "addition" that was not included in the Court's ruling. Furthermore, Defendants will have a copy of the letter the Court approves. Finally, Plaintiffs' attorneys are officers of the Court, and it can and should be presumed that they will act ethically and obey the Court's order (and they will gladly certify to the Court that they have done so, as soon as the letters are sent out).

Based on the foregoing Plaintiffs respectfully request that an expedited ruling be made on the pleadings, or that a hearing be set as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted, this 5th day of November, 2008.

/s/Sharon Preston
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 5, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing Request for Hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion to Approve Plaintiffs' Proposed Letter and Proposed Amended Website with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which sent notification of such filing to the following:

Leslie L. Abbott
Hannah J. Cole
Mary C. Dollarhide
Gerry B. Holman

/s/Stephanie Brown
Stephanie Brown